

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/903,257	07/11/2001	Steven M. Cohn	2003034-0002 9439	
22204	7590 03/27/2006		EXAMINER	
NIXON PEABODY, LLP			THEIN, MARIA TERESA T	
401 9TH STREET, NW SUITE 900			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20004-2128			3627	

DATE MAILED: 03/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		09/903,257	COHN ET AL.				
Office A	ction Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Marissa Thein	3627				
The MAILING Period for Reply	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
WHICHEVER IS LO - Extensions of time may after SIX (6) MONTHS fit - If NO period for reply is a Failure to reply within the Any reply received by the	TATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY DNGER, FROM THE MAILING Do available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 om the mailing date of this communication. Specified above, the maximum statutory period we set or extended period for reply will, by statute the Office later than three months after the mailing stment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONEI	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)⊠ Responsive t	o communication(s) filed on 05 Ja	anuary 2006.					
2a) ☐ This action is	FINAL. 2b) This	action is non-final.					
3) Since this ap							
closed in acc	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,4</u>	and 6-31 is/are pending in the ap	olication.					
4a) Of the ab	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s)	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,4 and 6-31</u> is/are rejected.						
	is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s)	are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.					
Application Papers							
9) The specifica	tion is objected to by the Examine	er.					
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority under 35 U.S.	C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:							
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage							
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).							
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
•							
Attachment(s)		_					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date							
	e Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)		Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 09/903,257

Art Unit: 3627

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on January 5, 2006 has been entered.

## Response to Amendment

Applicants' "Amendment" filed on January 5, 2006 has been considered.

Applicants' response by virtue of amendment to claim 17 have overcome the Examiner's rejection of such claims under 35 USC 101.

Claims 1, 7, 9, 11-12, 16, and 17 are amended. New claims 18-31 are added.

Claims 1, 4, and 6-31 remain pending in this application.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The phrase "....on-line directory of sellers" is sellers the vendors. It is unclear if Applicant is referring back to sellers as vendors.

Application/Control Number: 09/903,257

Art Unit: 3627

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 4, 6-8, 10-14, 16-27, and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,968,513 to Rinebold et al.

Regarding claim 1, Rinebold discloses an apparatus connecting buyers and seller of products and services (goods and services, col. 11, lines 29-30) comprising: a comprehensive directory of companies (col. 11, lines 19-22; col. 16, lines 41-52; Figures 13-14); a user maintained database of registered and subscribing companies selected from the comprehensive directory (col. 11, lines 24-26; col. 14, lines 6-7; col. 17, lines 9-35; col. 18, lines 29-30); service-brokering tools (col. 11, lines 40-57; Figure 13); registering means (col. 11, lines 24-34; col. 14, lines 6-7; col. 17, lines 9-35; col. 18, lines 29-30); contacting means (col. 14, lines 3-21); searching means (col. 13, lines 14-19), based on geographical boundaries (col. 12, lines 12-19; col. 13, lines 19-21); assigning means denoting a weighted importance to provider characteristics associated with each subscribing buyer and seller using object affiliations to indicate a level of presence each object is given in the directory, wherein the level of presence is based upon company profile, search result positioning and access to request for proposals to

Art Unit: 3627

afford each subscribing buyer and seller to be listed in multiple brands (col. 16, lines 28-47; col. 19, lines 40-50; col. 21, lines 35-55); ordering means for ranking buyers and seller according to the weighted importance of provider (col. 16, lines 28-47); branding means (col. 11, lines 29-41; col. 14, lines 64 – col. 15, line 6; col. 19, lines 17-30; col. 19, lines 51-54); and internal mechanism (col. 10, lines 25-col. 11, line 16; col. 25, lines 46-64; Figure 54).

Regarding claims 4 and 6, Ross discloses the object that can be used to generate private label interface-specific HTML; and a mechanism to synchronize partner information (col. 11, lines 29-41; col. 14, lines 64 – col. 15, line 6; col. 19, lines 17-30; col. 19, lines 51-54; col. 25, lines 46-col. 26, line 16).

Regarding claims 7-8, 12-13, 15, 19, and 22-27, Rinebold discloses means for collecting, storing, sharing requests for proposals (col. 13, line 61 – col. 14, line 21; col. 16, lines 28-36); means for geographical radius searching(col. 12, lines 12-19; col. 13, lines 14-21); and means for partner web site branding (col. 11, lines 29-41; col. 14, lines 64 – col. 15, line 6; col. 19, lines 17-30; col. 19, lines 51-54; col. 22, lines 53-63; col. 20, lines 39-60; col. 25, line 65 – col. 26, line 16); a data sharing engine (col. 13, line 61 – col. 14, line 21); means for subscription a request brokering engine (col. 11, lines 24-26; col. 14, lines 6-7; col. 17, lines 9-35; col. 18, lines 29-30); a request for brokering engine (col. 11, lines 40-57; Figure 13); an object catalog manager (col. 22, lines 32-52); means for a catalog synchronization process (col. 10, lines 25-col. 11, line 16; col. 22, lines 32-52; col. 25, lines 46-64). Furthermore, Rinebold discloses a request notification mechanism generates targeted communication to providers when a new request for

Art Unit: 3627

proposal is posted, which includes means for accessing the newly posted request for proposal (col. 14, lines 1-2; col. 14, lines 14-17; col. 18, line 66 – col. 19, line 6; col. 21, lines 34-63); the request notification mechanism further generates a communiqué to buyers when a provider submits a response to the buyer's request for proposal (col. 14, lines 1-2; col. 14, lines 14-17; col. 18, line 66 – col. 19, line 6; col. 21, lines 34-63); the request aging process mechanism communicates with buyers when a buyer's request for proposals is about to expire and when out-of-date requests for proposals are not acted upon by buyers (col. 25, lines 46-52); an object catalog manager maintains information regarding the web community related to buyers and providers and the request for proposals (col. 11, lines 17-27; col. 11, lines 40-57; col. 22, lines 53 – col. 23, line 9); means for a catalog synchronization processor deploys the partner web sites across a load-balance farm of web servers and synchronizes memory caches on each of the web servers (col. 10, lines 25-col. 11, line 16; col. 22, lines 53- col. 23, line 9; col. 25, lines 8-18)

Regarding claims 10-11 and 14, 16, Rinebold discloses a partner management tool; a brand distribution service; a partner-branding framework; a web server with software having encapsulating technologies; programming objects; a template; navigating to a private labeled interface; clicking a registration hyperlink; selecting a subscription package; building a profile of a company; categorizing the provide by selecting main categories and sub-categories; and creating an affiliation (col. 10, lines 25-col. 11, line 16; col. 11, lines 29-41; col. 14, lines 64 – col. 15, line 6; col. 19, lines

17-30; col. 19, line 39-col. 20, line 3; col. 25, lines 46-col. 26, line 16; col. 20, lines 39-60)

Regarding claims 17-18, Rinebold discloses the method for connecting buyer and sellers of products and services comprising: maintaining a comprehensive online directory of sellers (col. 11, lines 19-22; col. 16, lines 41-52; Figures 13-14); providing a request for proposal application for integration into a web site (col. 14, lines 1-17; col. 21, line 9 – col. 22, line 31); co-branding the request for proposal application with buyer and seller information (col. 21, line 9 – col. 22, line 31); maintaining a searchable directory of companies (col. 13, lines 14-19); providing an e-commerce infrastructure (col. 20, lines 39-48); and marketing a private-labeled web site of said buyer partner (col. 21, line 9 – col. 22, line 31); and providing usage and revenue reports that detail usage on the private-labeled web site of the buyer partner (col. 22, lines 32-52).

Regarding claim 20, Rinebold discloses the data sharing engine includes: a database that stores data from partner web sites; a private label interface; and a partner parent site (col. 11, lines 29-38; col. 20, lines 39-60; col. 25, line 65 – col. 26, line 16).

Regarding claim 21, Rinebold discloses the subscription sales processor provides termed presence including: a company profile; a search result positioning mechanism; and access to the requests for proposals (col. 16, lines 28-36; col. 16, lines 42-47; col. 17, lines 19-44; col. 19, lines 57-col. 20, line 4).

Regarding claims 30-31, Rinebold discloses a site branding system to co-brand the request for proposal; a partner management tool; a brand distribution service; and a

Art Unit: 3627

partner branding framework (col. 11, lines 29-38; col. 20, lines 39-60; col. 25, line 65 – col. 26, line 16).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 9, 15,and 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,968,513 to Rinebold et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,991,739 to Cupps et al.

Rinebold substantially discloses the claimed invention, however, it does not explicitly disclose GeoCode table relating latitude and longitude information and to generate unique longitude and latitude coordinates. Rinebold discloses geographically area (abstract) and inputting of zip codes (col. 12, lines 12-15).

Cupps, on the other hand, teaches GeoCode table relating latitude and longitude information and to generate unique longitude and latitude coordinates (col. 6, lines 31-44).

Therefore, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Rinebold, to include GeoCode table relating latitude and longitude information and to generate unique longitude and latitude coordinates, as taught by Cupps, in order to determine a buyers specified geographic area is within a particular area of service (Cupps, col. 6, lines 19-21).

# Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 4, and 6-31 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent No. 5,930,474 to Dunworth et al. a software interface which acts to organize information available on the Internet based upon geographical distribution.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marissa Thein whose telephone number is 571-272-6764. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alex Kalinowski can be reached on 571-272-6771. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 09/903,257 Page 9

Art Unit: 3627

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mtot March 20, 2006

STEVE B. MICALLISTER PRIMARY EXAMINER

SFB.n. allot